DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 231 SP 007 462

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Gladman, O. L. |
| TITLE | A Proposed Program for Training of Effective Supervising Teachers at Ottawa University. Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Ottawa Univ., Kans. |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. |
| BUREAU NO | BR-2-G-050 |
| PUB DATE | May 73 |
| GRANT | OEG-7-72-0026 |
| NOTE | 53p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Cooperating Teachers; *Demonstration Programs; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Education |

ABSTRACT

This student teaching program was designed to strengthen communication and interpersonal relationships between the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, and the college supervisor. It was also planned to test the adaptability of an inner-city teacher training program to a rural environment (Ottawa) and to continue the pursuit of more effective student teacher training at Ottawa. A 2-week workshop brought the three types of school personnel together daily. During the first week, the supervising teachers met to confront issues related to effective teaching. Various video and audio materials were used, along with standard lectures. The second week was designed to allow the cooperating and student teachers to discuss various teaching techniques using miniteaching formats. A third week (spread out over the '72-73 fall term) included presentations by administrators, modulation diagnostic center personnel, classroom teachers, and college personnel. Results indicated that the students in the model program were quicker to express more positive and open feelings to their supervising teachers than students not in the program. (Three appendixes of data are presented.) (JB/CL)

ED 084231

Final Report

Project No. 2-G-050
Grant No. OEG-7-72-0026

# A Proposed Program for Training of Effective Supervising Teachers at Ottawa University

O. L. Gladman
Ottawa University

Ottawa, Kansas

May, 1973

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

National Center for Educational Research and Development

SP 007 462

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

## Abstract

The major purpose of this project was to utilize existing materials used by Mid Continent Regional Education Laboratory in their Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program; apply it to a setting outside the Inner City and test the results of the field test against data collected in the Inner City setting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Preface | v |
| Section I | 1 |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Method | 3 |
| Results | 5 |
| Section II - McRel's Analysis | 7 |
| Method | 7 |
| Results | 9 |
| Appendices | 17 |
| Appendix A | 17 |
| Appendix B | 19 |
| Appendix C | 26 |

## Preface

To assess and adjust the final phase of preparation of prospective classroom teachers necessitates involvements primarily aimed at the areas of inter-personal relationships and communications between student teacher, cooperating teacher, and college supervisor. Particularly is this true in the student teaching segment of teacher preparation.

This project attempted to accomplish the following:

(1) to take an existing set of materials and field test them in a setting different than that for which they were originally designed,

(2) to clarify the three major roles involved in the student teaching situation: the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, and the college supervisor

(3) to work on a system of clarifying and developing an inter-personal rapport between the persons identified in item 2 above,

(4) to derive both hard and soft data which would produce a working format of procedure for future development and redirective for the student teaching program at Ottawa University.

In order to carry this out to a satisfactory conclusion - one which has meaning for the clarification of McRel's materials and for the future direction of Ottawa University's Teacher Education program demands the cooperation and efforts of the many people who are involved in the Student Teaching program.

Classroom teachers within Title I Schools located in Unified School District 290 were selected on the basis of desire to participate, school representation, and grade level. Student teachers were selected on the basis of desire to participate and grade level desire for student teaching.

McRel staff and Ottawa University staff were brought together to implement and carry out the program format for the workshop.

Thanks to Dr. Larry Shepoiser for his efforts and leadership expertise in establishing and carrying out the basic content and procedure of the project. Special thanks also to Dr.'s Don Nease and Fred Zook for their efforts. Our sincere thanks to the public schools of Ottawa for their assistance, cooperation, and contributions which made this truly a cooperative effort.

## Section I

### Introduction

Two important needs were satisfied by this project. First, to test a program designed for the inner city teacher education program in a setting outside the inner city, and second to continue the search for a more effective student teacher program at Ottawa University.

The first need did, in its satisfaction, provide the structure and content for the program. Included therein, were various experiences aimed at the development of interpersonal relationships between student teacher and cooperating teacher. Could the material (program) bring about an establishment of certain feelings and attitudes and do these compare favorably with data growing out of similar work with the same material used in the inner city. If so, then, to a degree we could say that the inner city program was adaptable to other kinds of enviromental setting--in this case, a small rurally oriented community.

Second, the traditional program of student teaching at Ottawa University fell short in producing the highest degree of proficiency in the student teacher. We felt to a great extent that was due to:

(1) a need to adequately define the various roles,

(2) a lack of pre-student teaching contact between the student teacher and cooperating teacher,

(3) lack of rapport in establishing effective communication channels,

(4) a mutual concern for teacher preparation between public schools and college personnel.

Our hypothesis was--given a prescribed set of experiences between student teacher, cooperating teacher, and college supervisor the student teaching experience could be drastically altered toward being a more

effective experience. Secondly, we hypothesised that the materials used in the inner city would be effective in another situation.

The primary objectives of the project were:

(1) to expand the base data of the training model developed by McRel,

(2) to test the validity of the training model outside the inner city setting,

(3) to gather data which would allow Ottawa University to redirect and strengthen its student teaching program, and

(4) to gather data which would have significance for similar programs in other small college student teaching programs.

## Method

The method employed was to create a workshop setting, bring into direct contact student teacher, cooperating teacher, and college supervisors who together would confront the issue of Development of Interpersonal Relationships.

Through utilization of college facilities we were able to utilize large and small group discussions, inputs from resource leaders and staff, video and audio taping experiences, actual mini-teaching situations, analyzation of self and others, and materials which focused on the development of interpersonal relationships as they relate to the cooperating teacher - student teacher roles.

The workshop met daily in the summer for a period of two weeks. During this time, under the direction of Dr. Larry Shepoiser, the participants fulfilled the following schedule:

(1) The first week supervising teachers met in various experiences which allowed them to confront issues related to establishing effective teaching models. Various media used were lectures, audio taping, video teaching sessions, and analyzing techniques related to teaching effectiveness.

(2) The second week brought student teachers and cooperating teachers together. Various experiences allowed student teacher and cooperating teachers to build together a concern relationship centered around effective teaching. Audio and video experiences were centered around classroom teaching settings. Classrooms were set up with children ages 5-13. Each student teacher prepared and taught a mini-lesson to a group of children. The tape was then viewed by student teachers and cooperating teachers. Analyzation of teaching style and effectiveness was then made.

(3) The third week of the project was spread out over the Fall sessions of the 72-73 academic year. A total of five sessions which entailed presentations by public school administrators, modulation diagnostic center personnel, classroom teacher, and college personnel were structured. The major goal of this third week was to move the student teacher from the workshop setting to the actual classroom - student teaching - setting.

Evaluation techniques were designed to allow each participant to analyze himself, the student teacher to be analyzed by his/her supervising teacher--both in attitude, interpersonal aspects, and teaching style.

## Results

Two kinds of results were obtained as a result of the project. First, there was the hard data results which come from the efforts of McRel and the use of the McRel model materials. These results are shown in Section II of this report--and take the form of a complete data analysis. Secondly, there is the soft data which we gained as a result of the project. This data speaks to objectives 3 and 4 specifically (as listed on page 2).

Usually, in student teaching programs, students and supervising teachers must use the first 1-3 weeks to establish rapport, build confidence in one another and find effective lines of communication. The establishment of rapport between cooperating teachers and student teachers was a most important outcome of the program. Spending two weeks together in experiences centered around common concerns in instruction was invaluable. By the time the student teaching experience began there was, by and large, a great deal of commonality and positive feelings in existence between students and their supervising teachers. Particularly was this noticeable when we compared the project group with the group of students who did not go through the program. In the latter group it took about four weeks for the same level of rapport and confidence to be established. That is a large segment of time to come out of a seven week student teaching experience. The participant group of student teachers - when they began their student teaching experience immediately began teaching, planning, and working most effectively with children. This immediate involvement and the level

of proficiency displayed we attributed directly to the effectiveness of the workshop experience.

Another bit of soft data was the attitude of the supervising teacher in analyzing his own teaching style. This attitude we saw result in greater concern for the growth of the individual teaching style of the student teacher - allowing time for growth and guidance. All in all this paid off in outstanding growth in the student teacher.

A Pilot Test of the Supervisor-Supervisee Relations material was conducted at Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas, during the week of August 21-25, 1972. The material was developed to be presented during a 30 hour training period. Typically, this training period would be six hours per day for five consecutive days. Due to time constraints, however, the total time for the Pilot Test at Ottawa was approximately 25 hours. The purpose of this test was twofold: first, to determine the exportability of the materials and second to determine what the effect, if any, shortening the time would have on the measured outcomes.

## Method

Subjects. Ss were a non-random sample of 14 Supervising Teachers and their assigned Student Teachers (total N=28). The Supervising Teachers (ST) were from Unified School District 290, Ottawa, Kansas. Nine of the Supervising Teachers were from three elementary schools in the district and five were from the junior high school (grades 7-9) in the district. All schools represented were recipients of Title I or Model Cities funds. The Student Teachers (St) were all Senior education majors at Ottawa University.

A distribution of the STs by grade level is shown in Table 1. Of the five 7-9 grade teachers, two taught English, one taught Physical Education, one taught Fine Arts, and one taught Home Economics and Science.

TABLE 1

Distribution of Supervising Teachers by Grade Level

| GRADE LEVEL | FREQUENCY |
|---|---|
| 7-9 | 5 |
| 4-6 | 6 |
| 1-3 | 2 |
| K | 1 |

As may be seen in Table 2, this group of Supervising Teachers has had

considerable classroom experience ($\bar{X}$=10.6 years), has been at this present school over a period of time ($\bar{X}$=5.3 years) and one-half of the group were experienced Supervisors (4 or more years).

TABLE 2

Distribution of Teaching Experience, time at Present School and Supervisory Experience of Participating Supervising Teachers

| Years | Total Teaching | Present School | Supervising |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10 or more | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| 7-9 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 4-6 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| 1-3 | 5 | 7 | 2 |
| 0 | | | 5 |

Trainers. Dr. Lawrence Shepoiser, Chairman of the Education/Psychology Division at Ottawa University was the principal trainer. He was assisted by Clifford Tatham, a member of the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory staff.

Schedule of Activities. As stated previously, the total amount of time for this test was reduced from 30 to approximately 25 hours due to time constraints. An agenda of the day-to-day activities may be found in Appendix B of this report.

Instruments. To assess the participants' understanding of the concepts and their perceptions of their team's interpersonal relations, the following instruments were employed:

1. the Content Quiz
2. the McREL Interaction Analysis Quiz
3. the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory

The Content Quiz was composed of 30 true-false items relating to the models and concepts presented and was developed by the program staff at McREL.

The McREL Interaction Analysis Quiz (MIA Quiz) consisted of 20 items relating to the MIA material; it too was developed by the McREL staff.

The Relationship Inventory is a 64 item inventory developed by Barrett-Lennard (1962) to assess a dyadic relationship. There are three forms of this instrument, two of which were used in this study; the MO and OS forms. The items in the MO form relate to the concept, "How I see the other person." An example of the items: "I respect her as a person." The items in the OS form are concerned with "How I think the other person perceives me." An example of the items: "She respects me as a person."

The Content Quiz and Relationship Inventory were administered on a pre-posttest basis. The MIA Quiz was administered at the conclusion of the activities associated with the MIA.

Statistical Analysis. The pre-posttest scores of the Content Quiz and of the Relationship Inventory were analyzed using Sandler's A Test of Significance. (Sandler, 1955). Furthermore, the following two performance criteria were employed in this study: 1) Sixty-five percent (65%) of the participants will answer correctly 70% or more of the items on the posttest of the Content Quiz and 2) Sixty-five percent (65%) of the participants will answer correctly 70% of the items on the MIA Quiz. In addition, test-retest reliability coefficients for the Content Quiz and the Relationship Inventory were computed. An estimate of internal reliability for the MIA Quiz was determined using Saupe's estimate of KR-20 (Saupe, 1961).

## Results

The pre- and posttest results for the Content Quiz are shown in Table 3. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant ($A=.065$; $df=27$; $p<.001$). In addition, 85.7% of the participants met the criterion of answering 70% or more of the items correctly on the posttest. That is, 85.7% of the group got 21 or more

of the items correct. The test-retest reliability coefficient was an $r$=.277 (NS).

Table 4 contains the frequency distribution of scores on the MIA Quiz. The range of scores was from 4 to 20 with a mean of 15.28. Eighty-two percent (82%) of the participants attained the performance criterion of 70% (14) or more of the items correct. The estimate of reliability (internal consistency) obtained for the MIA Quiz was a $r$=.765.

The results of the pre- and posttest for the Supervising Teachers on the Relationship Inventory are shown in Tables 5 and 6. The difference between the mean scores on Form MO was statistically significant ($A$=.170; df=13; $p<.01$) as was the difference between the mean scores on Form OS ($A$=.127; df=13; $p<.01$). The test-retest reliability coefficient for Form MO was $r$=.778 and for Form OS $r$=.800.

The pre- and posttest results for the Student Teachers on the Relationship Inventory are shown in Tables 7 and 8. The difference between the mean scores on Form MO was not significant ($A$=.306; df=13; $p<.10$). A statistically significant difference was obtained between the mean scores on Form OS ($A$=.197; df=13; $p<.02$). The test-retest reliability coefficient for Form MO was $r$=.836 and for Form OS the coefficient was $r$=.765.

TABLE 3

Frequency Distribution of Pre- and Posttest Scores on Content Quiz for All Participants (N =28)

| SCORE | FREQUENCY PRE | FREQUENCY POST |
|---|---|---|
| 26-30 | 0 | 4 |
| 21-25 | 10 | 20 |
| 16-20 | 17 | 4 |
| 11-15 | 1 | 0 |
| 6-10 | 0 | 0 |
| | $\bar{X}_{pre}$=19.6 | $\bar{X}_{post}$=23.0 |

TABLE 4

Frequency Distribution of Scores on the MIA Quiz for All Participants (N=26)

| SCORE | FREQUENCY |
|---|---|
| 19-20 | 6 |
| 17-18 | 6 |
| 15-16 | 6 |
| 13-14 | 5 |
| 11-12 | 1 |
| 9-10 | 3 |
| 7-8 | 0 |
| 5-6 | 0 |
| 3-4 | 1 |
| 1-2 | 0 |

TABLE 5

Frequency Distribution of Pre- and Posttest Total Scores on the Relationship Inventory, Form MO, for Supervising Teachers

| SCORE | FREQUENCY | |
|---|---|---|
| | PRE | POST |
| 150-159 | | 2 |
| 140-149 | | 1 |
| 130-139 | | 1 |
| 120-129 | | |
| 110-119 | 1 | |
| 100-109 | 3 | 2 |
| 90-99 | | 2 |
| 80-89 | 3 | 1 |
| 70-79 | 2 | 1 |
| 60-69 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-59 | 2 | 1 |
| 40-49 | 1 | 1 |
| 30-39 | | |
| 20-29 | | |
| 10-19 | | 1 |
| 0-9 | | |
| -10--1 | 1 | |

TABLE 6

Frequency Distribution of Pre- and Posttest Total Scores on the Relationship Inventory, Form OS, for Supervising Teachers

| SCORE | FREQUENCY PRE | POST |
|---|---|---|
| 150-159 | | 1 |
| 140-149 | | 2 |
| 130-139 | | |
| 120-129 | | |
| 110-119 | 1 | 1 |
| 100-109 | | 1 |
| 90-99 | 2 | 3 |
| 80-89 | 1 | 1 |
| 70-79 | 2 | 1 |
| 60-69 | 2 | |
| 50-59 | 1 | 1 |
| 40-49 | 1 | 1 |
| 30-39 | 1 | 1 |
| 20-29 | 1 | |
| 10-19 | | |
| 0-9 | 1 | |
| -10--1 | | |
| -20--11 | | |
| -30--21 | | 1 |
| -40--31 | 1 | |

TABLE 7

Frequency Distribution of Pre- and Posttest Total Scores on the Relationship Inventory, Form MO, for Student Teachers

| SCORE | FREQUENCY PRE | POST |
|---|---|---|
| 140-149 | | 1 |
| 130-139 | | |
| 120-129 | | |
| 110-119 | 1 | 1 |
| 100-109 | 2 | 3 |
| 90-99 | | |
| 80-89 | | 2 |
| 70-79 | 3 | |
| 60-69 | 2 | 2 |
| 50-59 | 2 | 1 |
| 40-49 | 1 | 1 |
| 30-39 | | |
| 20-29 | 1 | 1 |
| 10-19 | | 1 |
| 0-9 | 1 | 1 |
| -10--1 | | |
| -20--11 | | |
| -30--21 | | |
| -40--31 | 1 | |

TABLE 8

Frequency Distribution of Pre- and Posttest Total Scores on the Relationship Inventory, Form OS, for Student Teachers

| SCORE | FREQUENCY PRE | POST |
|---|---|---|
| 130-139 | | 1 |
| 120-129 | | |
| 110-119 | | 2 |
| 100-109 | 1 | 1 |
| 90-99 | 1 | 3 |
| 80-89 | 1 | 1 |
| 70-79 | 4 | 1 |
| 60-69 | | |
| 50-59 | 2 | |
| 40-49 | 2 | 2 |
| 30-39 | 1 | 1 |
| 20-29 | | 2 |
| 10-19 | | |
| 0-9 | 2 | |

## Discussion

The results of the Pilot Test at Ottawa University tend to suggest the following:

1. that a trainer with minimal assistance from McRel staff can conduct the program and obtain adequate results, that is, the program is transportable, and

2. that decreasing the total time alloted for the training does not appear to have an adverse effect upon attaining the general outcomes of the program.

The non-significant test-retest reliability coefficient may be the result of a relatively truncated distribution of scores, particularly on the posttest as shown in Table 3. When a performance criterion, such as the one used in this Pilot Test, is employed and when this criterion is met, the variance will be restricted. This restriction of variance will thereby reduce the correlation coefficient. This possible explanation of the non-significant coefficient should not preclude a review of the Content Quiz. It may be that a multiple-choice format should be employed instead of the present True-False format.

The significant changes on the Relationship Inventory for Supervising Teachers tends to suggest that their perceptions of their student teachers become more positive and that they, the Supervisors, also perceived their relationships with their Student Teachers as being more open. The shift on the OS form of the Relationship Inventory for Student Teachers tends to suggest that the Student Teachers perception of their Supervisors changed considerably. It is possible that the Student Teachers had some stereotype images of what Supervisors were to be like and that these images were modified as a result of the Pilot Test experience. This significant change on the OS form also tends to suggest that the Student Teachers perceived their relationship with the Supervisor as becoming more open.

The participants in this Pilot Test made numerous comments regarding the McREL Interaction Analysis. The tenor of these arguments indicates that while they, as a group, see positive values in the MIA, it is also seen as a cumbersome tool with which to work. Their comments supported the idea of concentrating on three or four types of teaching behavior as a means of gathering information to help one another. Some of the Supervisors had been trained to use Flanders' Interaction Analysis but felt that it was too time consuming. They also felt this was true for the MIA.

## Summary and Conclusions

In summary, the results of this Pilot Test tend to indicate that the materials are transportable and that some decrease in training time is possible. Statistically significant differences between the pre- and posttest scores on the Content Quiz tend to suggest that the concepts and models presented were understood. In addition, the performance criteria established for this Pilot Test were met.

It is recommended that the Content Quiz be revised for possible modifications. It is also recommended that the materials regarding the MIA matrix be deleted and

that emphasis be placed upon three or four types of teaching behaviors. Finally, it is recommended that the use of the Relationship Inventory not be included as a part of the training materials. This instrument lacks normative data and requires training that is beyond that which is necessary to conduct a training program based upon these materials.

## References

Sandler, J. A test of the significance of the difference between the means of correlated measures, based on a simplification of Student's t. British Journal of Psychology, 1955, 46, 225-226.

Saupe, J. L. Some useful estimates of the KR formula #2 reliability coefficient. Educational Psychological Measurement, 1961, 21, 63-71.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

# APPENDIX A

## List of Participants

| School | Cooperative Teacher | Grade Level or Area |
|---|---|---|
| Junior High | Mrs. JoAnn Cearfoss<br>1003 Willow, Ottawa | English |
| Junior High | Mrs. Dorothy Mohr<br>RFD 1, Ottawa | English |
| Junior High | Mrs. Mary Jane Martin<br>823 Willow, Ottawa | Science |
| Junior High | Mrs. Carolyn Pope<br>1229 Elm, Ottawa | Phys. Educ. |
| Junior High | John Leonard | Art |
| Lincoln | Russel C. Daugharthy, Jr.<br>313 S. Hickory, Ottawa | 6 |
| Lincoln | Mrs. Letha Figgins<br>416 E. 14th, Ottawa | 4 |
| Lincoln | Mrs. Particia Brownell<br>1243 S. Elm, Ottawa | 3 |
| Eugene Field | Mrs. Katherine Cornwell<br>1423 Kentucky<br>Lawrence, Ks. | Kindergarten |
| Eugene Field | Edwin Coward<br>915 Olive, Ottawa | 6 |
| Eugene Field | Mrs. Marian Alderman<br>1202 Willow<br>Ottawa | 4 |
| Hawthorne | Mrs. Cheryl Daugharthy<br>313 S. Hickory, Ottawa | 6 |
| Hawthorne | Mrs. Marilyn Chappell<br>1413 S. Main, Ottawa | 6 |
| Hawthorne | Mrs. Naomi Harrah<br>808 S. Mulberry<br>Ottawa | 3 |

| School | Student Teacher | Grade Level or Area |
|---|---|---|
| Junior High | Charles English<br>Price Hall, O.U. | English |
| Junior High | Donna Krug<br>2015 S. Kiwanis<br>Sioux Falls, S.D. 57105 | English |
| Junior High | Jodi Rush<br>820 E. Kansas Ave.<br>Smith Center, Ks. 66967 | Science |
| Junior High | Vickie McKim<br>Morrill, Kansas 66515 | Phys. Educ. |
| Junior High | Pam Nelson<br>803 S. Main, Ottawa | Art |
| Lincoln | Dale King<br>8245 Switzer<br>Overland Park, Ks. | 6 |
| Lincoln | Helen Wilson<br>Box 272<br>Lucas, Ks. 67648 | 4 |
| Lincoln | Marsha Gunnels<br>1704 N. Broadway<br>Larned, Kansas | 3 |
| Eugene Field | Kathy Malone<br>408 S. Water<br>Olathe, Kansas 66061 | Kindergarten |
| Eugene Field | Cindy Weaver<br>ABA STAFF<br>Green Lake, Wis. | 6 |
| Eugene Field | Fredda Breslaw<br>48 Marvin Drive<br>Kings Park, N.Y. 11754 | 4 |
| Hawthorne | Myra Rogier<br>Oak Hills<br>Highland, Illinois 62244 | 6 |
| Hawthorne | Helen Angus<br>Rural Route #3<br>Mount Ayr, Iowa 50854 | 6 |
| Hawthorne | Mary Byleen<br>121 S. Sherman<br>North Platte, Neb. 69101 | 3 |

# APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT MANUAL

Ottawa University - McREL

SUPERVISOR-SUPERVISEE RELATIONS WORKSHOP
AGENDA

Monday - August 21, 1972

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:00 - 8:15 am | - | Orientation |
| 8:15 - 8:30 am | - | Data Collection |
| 8:30 - 9:20 am | - | Team Development Exercise I: Turn-On - Turn-Off |
| 9:20 - 9:50 am | - | Team Development Exercise II: Expectations |
| 9:50 - 10:00 am | - | Break |
| 10:00 - 11:00 am | - | Team Development Exercise III: Johari Window |
| 11:00 - 12:00 am | - | Team Development Exercise IV Problem Solving Model |
| 12:00 - 12:30 pm | - | LUNCH |
| 12:30 - 12:45 pm | - | Team Process Analysis |
| 12:45 - 1:00 pm | - | Data Collection |
| 1:00 - 1:15 pm | - | Case Study Exercise |
| 1:15 - 2:15 pm | - | Model for Supervisor-Supervisee Interaction |
| 2:15 - 2:30 pm | - | Break |
| 2:30 - 3:15 pm | - | McREL Interaction Analysis |
| 3:15 - 4:00 pm | - | Interaction Matrix |

PARTICIPANT MANUAL

Ottawa University - McREL

SUPERVISOR-SUPERVISEE RELATIONS WORKSHOP
AGENDA

Tuesday - August 22, 1972

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:00 - 8:30 am | - | Videotape - Teaching Behavior |
| 8:30 - 9:15 am | - | Videotape - Analysis of Classroom Episode |
| 9:15 - 9:30 am | - | Team Process Analysis |
| 9:30 - 9:45 am | - | Evaluation |
| 9:45 - 10:00 am | - | Break |
| 10:00 - 11:15 am | - | Styles of Post-teaching Conferences |
| 11:15 - 12:00 am | - | Videotape - Conference Behaviors |

PARTICIPANT MANUAL

Ottawa University - McREL

SUPERVISOR-SUPERVISEE RELATIONS WORKSHOP
AGENDA

Wednesday - August 23, 1972

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8:00 - 9:30 am | - | Supervisor Teams - Student Teacher Teams |
| 9:30 - 9:45 am | - | Break |
| 9:45 - 11:15 am | - | Supervisor |
| 11:15 - 11:30 am | - | Team Process Analysis |
| 11:30 - 12:00 am | - | Pre-teaching Conference |

PARTICIPANT MANUAL

Ottawa University - McREL

SUPERVISOR-SUPERVISEE RELATIONS WORKSHOP
AGENDA

Thursday - August 24, 1972

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9:30 - 10:20 am | - | Microteaching |
| 10:20 - 10:30 am | - | Break |
| 10:30 - 12:00 am | - | Analysis of Teacher Behavior from VTR |
| 12:00 - 12:30 am | - | Post-teaching Conference |
| 12:30 - 1:00 pm | - | LUNCH |
| 1:00 - 1:30 pm | - | Analysis of Conference Behaviors from ATR |
| 1:30 - 2:20 pm | - | Microteaching |
| 2:20 - 2:30 pm | - | Break |
| 2:30 - 3:40 pm | - | Analysis of Teacher Behavior from VTR |
| 3:40 - 4:10 pm | - | Post-teaching Conference |
| 4:10 - 4:40 pm | - | Analysis of Conference Behaviors from ATR |
| 4:40 - 5:00 pm | - | Team Process Analysis |

PARTICIPANT MANUAL

Ottawa University - McREL

SUPERVISOR-SUPERVISEE RELATIONS WORKSHOP
AGENDA

Friday - August 25, 1972

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 12:30 - 1:15 pm | - | Team Development Exercise V: Force-field Analysis |
| 1:15 - 1:45 pm | - | Team Planning |
| 1:45 - 2:00 pm | - | Break |
| 2:00 - 3:15 pm | - | Behavioral Contracting |
| 3:15 - 4:00 pm | - | Data Collection |

College Supervisor

PANEL QUESTIONS

What does one look for in a student teacher?....cooperating teacher?... supervising professor?

Was the one week summer program as successful as expected?

Will student teachers receive any feedback after the student teaching process is over, in regard to the results of this program?

If problems should occur in the student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship, what role does the supervising professor play?

What methods are used in maintaining communication between student teachers and supervising professors?

On what basis is the student teacher evaluated^ Is the cooperating teacher evaluated in any way?

What things do supervising professors look for in their observations of the student teacher?

How often are student teachers observed by supervising professors?

Who does the observing and how are they selected?

What is the supervising professor's job in relation to the student teacher, the cooperating teacher and the administration?

Where does the main emphasis lie---on curriculum or method?

TO: Dr. William White
Mr. Dean Royse
Mr. Marlin Kimball
Mr. Ralph Loyd
Mr. Allen Unruh

FROM: Larry Shepoiser

SUBJECT: Principals' Panel for the Supervising Teachers Program - Wednesday, October 25, 7:00 p.m.

PLACE: Auditorium, Tauy Jones Hall

TOPIC: Public School working with student teachers

7:00 - Introduction of topic (Larry Shepoiser)

7:05 - 7:15 What are the expectations of UNFD 290 by and for student teachers? (Dr. Bill White)

7:15 - 7:25 Discussion

7:25 - 7:35 What does the principal expect of and for the student teachers? (Dean Royse)

7:35 - 7:45 Discussion

7:45 - 7:55 What does the principal expect by and for the student teachers by the cooperating teachers? (Marlin Kimball)

7:55 - 8:05 Discussion

8:05 - 8:15 What does the principal expect of and by the student teachers? (Allen Unruh)

8:15 - 8:25 Discussion

8:25 - 8:35 What does the principal expect of and by the college and college supervisors? (Ralph Loyd)

8:45 - 8:55 Discussion

8:55 - 9:00 Summary - (Larry Shepoiser)

# APPENDIX C

# APPENDIX C

## COPY OF PROPOSED PROGRAM

## TRAINING SUPERVISING TEACHERS

### INTRODUCTION

There is a need, in teacher education, to sharply scrutinize the effectiveness of the student teaching process as it now exists in teacher education programs across the country. This concern grows out of a general movement away from college supervisory domination to a greater acceptance of professional relationships on the part of public school supervising teachers in working with student teachers. It also grows out of an awareness of the need to make teacher preparation experiences more relavant for prospective teachers of all grade levels. There exists also a concern on how to bridge the gap that exists between teacher education preparation programs at the college level and the actual performance of student teachers during the student teaching experience. Generally, the trend is to more effectively place in the hands of public school supervising teachers the guidance, direction and evaluation of student teachers. This proposed program is premised upon the fact that this must take place as an outgrowth of a program built upon a close working relationship between college and public school personnel.

In the search for a way to improve the student teaching experience, there appears to be increasing merit in the public school supervising teacher assuming the major role in the supervision, the guidance, and the evaluation of the student teacher's progress throughout the student teaching experience. What is needed, it appears, is a program that allows a period of training for the supervising teacher as he/she prepares for the supervising relationship with the student teacher. The research literature does not provide any considerable amount of solid evidence regarding the best way to supervise the growth of the student teacher. However, the literature recently has become saturated with a growing concern over the relevancy of the student teacher's relationship with his supervising teacher. Too, there is considerable emperical evidence that the supervising teacher may enhance or negate whatever efforts and progress the college preparation experiences have made in a systematic approach to the nature of the teaching process.

Ottawa University provides the teacher education segment of its program with a favorable climate for program development. Ottawa University encourages program experimentation and development. The University has committed itself to changing the complex structure of General Education experiences so that the college student assumes a greater degree of self-direction and responsibility. It stands to reason that professional programs which are, by and large, built upon the general education experiences should also be modified so that the specialized phase of a prospective teacher's college program is more compatible with the beginning phase.

In 1969, Ottawa University set the stage for a more meaningful kind of teacher education student teaching experience when Ottawa University became a participating member of the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program operating under the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL). Since that time some teacher education candidates from Ottawa University have been able to participate by taking their student teaching semester in the CUTE program - fulfilling that phase of their program in an inner-city setting.

McREL has, this past year, been involved with a program of their own design in the Training of Effective Supervisor Teachers. During the summer of 1971, a member of the Department of Education of Ottawa University participated in a two week workshop conducted by McREL as a developmental test of this training model. In their efforts to extend the sampling, and consequently a broadening of the validity of this program, Ottawa University proposes a research study to test the effectiveness of this innovative training model for supervising teachers in a setting outside the inner-city.

More specifically the objective of this proposal will be:

(1) To expand the data base of the training model;
(2) To test the validity of the training model in a setting outside the inner-city;
(3) To afford Ottawa University the opportunity to seek a new direction in its student teaching program and, assuming that the program will be successful, it provides a base upon which to further expand, over a three year period, to full utilization of the program for the total student teaching experience;
(4) To provide data which may have significant implications for other small colleges in their student teaching programs.

## Description of Program

The implementation of this proposal will provide data to compare with inner city data already gathered. From that, it can be determined if the program is adaptable to school settings different from the inner city. If it is adaptable, then the implications of these findings for hundreds of small colleges in similar settings will be significant.

Training of Supervising Teachers is a program developed by McREL as a result of research findings in the CUTE program. The proposed program will utilize McREL's format as the basic material for implementation. The McRel program is described as:

> The Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory spent four years in developing and testing the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program. The result of their effort has been an educational product which has proven successful in alleviating many of the inadequacies of inner-city teacher preparation. In 1969, the CUTE program was one of five recognized by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education for distinguished achievement in the field of teacher education. The National Center for Educational Communication has selected the program as one of the ten regional laboratory products to be included in a United States Office of Education nationwide exhibit. This program is to be included in the Bell System Communication Seminar program which offers a series

of seminars for the benefit of business, industry, and educational institutions demonstrating innovative educational ideas. Ths U. S. Commissioner of Education's 1969-70 report includes it among "programs that have made outstanding attempts to bring together many of the elements necessary for a realistic, practical preparation for teachers of the economically disadvantaged."

Despite the successes of the program and the recognition which it has received, evaluation points to need for development of additional products which will further strengthen the program of teacher preparation for inner-city schools. The evidence clearly shows a pressing need for the development of an educational product to enhance the preparation of supervising teachers from inner city shcools.

Student teacher activities in the CUTE program are primarily directed by public school teachers who are not familiar with, and may not be sympathetic to, CUTE objectives emphasized in the eight weeks of seminars prior to student teaching. Evaluation reports of the CUTE program indicate student teachers experience change in their attitudes toward pupils from more to less favorable. Data from the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) and McREL Interaction Analysis show trends of teacher attitudes with significant changes in the desired direction during eight weeks of CUTE seminar instruction and decrement during the subsequent eight weeks of classroom student teaching. While in the classroom student teachers became more direct in teaching behavior and attitudes toward pupils became less positive. Yee's research (1969) using the MTAI substantiates these findings and concludes that attitudes of student teachers toward pupils generally reflect the predominant influence of supervising teachers. Although it is dangerous to attribute causation to any single factor, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that CUTE program objectives would be helped if supervising teachers were given training in supervision and in teaching consonant with the purposes of the program.

Excerpts from CUTE student teacher logs likewise indicate confusion created in student teachers by supervisors' conflicting teaching behaviors and approaches in the classroom. Some student teachers described graphically a transitional period which occurred as they adjusted to the classroom and took on behaviors demanded by the situation. Behaviors they once abhorred they began to see as "valuable." However, many were still disconcerted that classroom control was maintained by threats or punishment. They frequently felt supervisors to be overly rigid, too directive, or unreceptive to innovation. There appeared to be little or no effort to utilize teaching methods demonstrated in CUTE seminars.

In follow-up reports CUTE graduates assert that they felt supervising teachers restricted their effectiveness. Only fifteen to thirty-nine percent of CUTE graduates from three different program sites felt they learned more from cooperating teachers than from CUTE seminars. Thus there is evidence to suggest that improved supervising teacher training stands as an essential first step to further improvement of inner-city education.

Outcomes as described here are not unique to the CUTE program. Numerous reports of inner-city education verify the need for improving teaching performance and relations in the inner-city classroom. Evidence suggests that numbers of teachers working in the inner-city schools hold negative attitudes toward pupils and would rather be in a different type of school (Coleman, Campbell, et al., 1966; Miller & Woock, 1970). From the pupil's perspective if he is not treated with respect or if those responsible for his instruction believe him to be inadequate, his motivation and ability to learn are impaired. Low performance expectancy for pupils by inner-city teachers act as a self-fulfilling prophecy (Coleman, 1968; Clark, 1963). These behaviors can be assimilated by the student teacher and perpetuated, causing him to become ineffective as an inner-city teacher or they can create a frustrating and confusing teaching experience causing the student teacher to reject a teaching role in inner-city education.

If training experiences for future teachers are to have an optimum impact, some effort must be made to coordinate goals stressed during college training with those emphasized in the classroom by supervisors. Specific attention needs to be paid to the effects, both positive and negative, that supervisors have on the performance of prospective teachers. Ultimately, transactions during these encounters lead to the development of behavior patterns that affect the lives of children. Training packages must be developed and administered that will enhance the quality of supervision. Initial efforts must be directed toward the refinement of the teaching behaviors, the enhancement of sensitivity to personal interactions and the development of means for objective analysis of teaching behavior. For the continuance of educational growth of inner-city children it is imperative that the quality of the supervised teaching experience be the best that present educational thinking has to offer.[1]

In speaking to the rationale for the program the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory states,

Basic to a consideration of desirable role relationships between supervisors and supervisees in a classroom setting are decisions relative to the (1) purpose of education, (2) purpose of supervision, and (3) relationships that are congruent with these purposes. Because we live in a democratic society whose citizens provide schools for preparing young people to function according to this life style, schools should contribute to the effective operation of the democracy. Built into a democratic mode of living is the continual need for assessment and adjustment. Thus the changing nature of society demands citizens who are responsible individuals capable of participating in a decision-making process. One of the educational objectives of schools, then, should be to develop in pupils the ability to make intelligent decisions.

---

[1]Training Effective Supervising Teachers, Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, (1971). Grant Clothier, Coordinator.

Authoritarian procedures necessary in a totalitarian society seem highly inappropriate in a democratic setting. The purpose of education in a free society is not to "give"prefixed answers to pupils, but rather to help pupils discover how to solve problems that confront them now or that may confront them in later years. Instead of memorizing facts or particular expressions of ideas, the pupils should be learning to investigate alternatives. This approach does not lessen the necessity for broad as well as intensive studies of society's accumulated knowledge. However, it does mean that such knowledge is not an end in itself; it has wider application. Facts should be synthesized to reach appropriate decisions; they should be used for the solution of problems.

Inherent in this process is not only acquisition of knowledge, but development of skills for coping with life processes and relationships in attainment of goals. Thus, pupils, instead of accepting passively the pronouncements of the teacher, should be encouraged to question, to search, to reflect, to perceive and to reach defensible conclusions as goals are pursued in class.

It is felt that an educational setting designed to require critical thinking and verbal participation will not only provide development of and practice in these much needed skills but will also be a means of maintaining interest and incentive in a learning enviroment.

Such an educational program has obvious implication for the preparation of teachers and for methods used to induct them into the profession. There is evidence that teacher preparation is in a state of transition. Some educators are proposing varied types of clinical experiences. The concept of a differentiated staff is gaining adherents. Regardless of the configuration of future teacher preparation patterns, student teaching in its present form will probably continue to be the predominant pattern for entry into teaching during the next several years. Regardless of staffing patterns ultimately adopted by schools, the problem of role relationships during supervised instruction and teaching will persist.

Experiences of supervised teaching, it would appear, are to enable a prospective teacher to develop an understanding of the teacher's role which will serve as a foundation for future professional activity. This purpose harmonizes with the philosophical belief that experience produces values which, if reflected upon and refined, are effective guides for human activities. It is also in harmony with Dewey's conclusions that the discernment of relationships is impossible without experiences. These experiences must be of such quantity and variety as to provide ample opportunity for the supervisee to perceive their values and develop generalizations from them. If he is allowed to test in the classroom his information gained through seminar instruction plus his own deductions and if he perceives the supervised teaching experience as similar to actual classroom situations which he will face when he assumes an independent role as the classroom teacher, maximum benefit will be gained from such experience.

The premise here is that if a training program for future educators is to be successful, the prospective teacher will not view himself as guardian of the status quo or the architect of an ideal future social order. Neither can he assume the role of an "interested bystander" who merely coordinates the creative endeavors of individual pupils. It is essential that he comes to view his role as one who presents information, raises new questions, and helps pupils reach conclusions in harmony with the judgmental criteria considered to be applicable. He becomes the director of a continuing research effort in which pupils share a progressively increasing responsibility.

Teacher attitudes toward learners necessary for encouraging a problem-solving classroom climate are ones that regard the pupils with respect and acceptance, encouraging them to become involved in learning activities. The teacher must be capable of becoming involved with pupils in determining and accomplishing classroom goals, thus developing a classroom climate with an appropriate ratio of teacher and pupil talk. Teaching behaviors must become more indirect, thus motivating pupil participation. In addition to these desirable teacher attitudes, which may be prescribed for all classrooms, effective inner-city teachers will display empathy for the children and be committed to teaching the disadvantaged. These teachers are capable of recognizing and accepting the problems of the disadvantaged without rejecting the pupils who have these problems. The ineffective teacher is more closed minded and denies the existence of these problems, while at the same time rejecting or punishing those who exhibit symptoms of these unique problems. Pupils who do not succeed are probably innately lazy or may have some form of genetic deficiency. They should be punished for their deficiencies or lack of effect. Such pupils are found unpleasant to this teacher (Faunce, 1968-69).

Relationships between supervisors and supervisees appropriate to these educational purposes require flexibility and openness, permitting expression of individual differences and personal growth. Personal understandings can be shared, examined, tested, and reshaped; involvements must reach that point where mutual planning and evaluation is encouraged and implemented. Mutual give and take during these experiences will provide both supervisor and supervisee a broad, varied and more accurate perceptual framework and permit a more intelligent interaction. It will permit more realistic insights concerning the many facets of a teacher's role. Opportunities must be provided to observe the consequences of personal actions based on these insights as they are tested in operational situations. Not only must there be performance by the student teacher, but in return he must gain something from his performance. He perceives the consequences of his activity and evaluates his actions in terms of the goals he seeks to achieve. A high level of learning occurs as the supervisee is confronted with a problem situation, discusses it, decides on a course of action, and follows through.

Relative to student teacher - supervisor interpersonal interactions this quality of relationship is demanded since it is assumed individuals act on the basis of the perceptions of a given situation and perceptions are personal and subjective, resulting from exposure to past and present events. No two persons have exactly the same backgrounds and no two persons will perceive or handle a situation exactly the same. How the supervisor and supervisee perceive each other and their present teaching situation influences the results of their encounter. Evidence shows that supervisees are influenced by their supervisors. That supervising teachers themselves are influenced by supervisees is indicated in research by Rosenfeld (1969). Supervisors associated with more open-minded student teachers tended to develop favorable attitudes toward pupils. It would seem that harmony of relationships would increase where similar conceptualizations are shared about teaching approaches and transactions that should transpire in a work relationship.

It is the supervisor's responsibility to provide the supervisee situations where insights may be developed; to support him as he carries out his professional duties, and to assist him in the analysis of these experiences. An understanding by the supervisor and student teacher during occasions of teacher-analysis is that all persons function with partial knowledge when encountering new experiences and relationships. Both the supervisor and supervisee will grow as a result of this new involvement.

The failures of inner-city education have been fully documented. The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program has already made a significant contribution to the alleviation of these failures. The following program design for the improvement of inner-city classroom supervisors is viewed as a further step in the solution to this major education problem. It is understood that no brief workshop exposure as suggested here can be expected to provide all experiences essential to a fully matured supervising or teaching involvement, rather it is to provide basic understandings from which improved practices can develop.[2]

## STRUCTURE OF PROPOSED PROGRAM

The proposed program will follow, in its entirety, the Training Effective Supervising Teachers program of McREL. In their description of developmental strategies, the McREL program states:

Based on the evaluation results from the CUTE program and in harmony with the conceptualization of the elements essential for the further improvement of inner-city teaching, the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory proposes to provide a series of multi-media training

---

[2] Ibid.

products which will enable supervising teachers to acquire behaviors that will improve their effectiveness in training student teachers for inner-city schools. These products will deal with the three problem areas which CUTE evaluation results show are most in need of improvement. These areas are need for (1) improved teacher behaviors which increase quantity and quality of inner-city pupil participation, (2) increased teacher sensitization to interpersonal relations, and (3) improved techniques for objective evaluation of teaching behavior.

As a total unit, these products will comprise a training package to increase supervising teacher effectiveness in inner-city schools. Initial developmental testing of the products will take place in a concentrated two week, full-day summer workshop setting with five additional training days during the autumn. However, the content of each module will be designed to enable effective utilization of materials in smaller time blocks.

Product development specialists have also carefully designed each module as flexible, largely self-contained units. Thus each module can be used individually in a variety of settings. For example, in addition to its specifically designed use, the product to improve teaching behavior could probably be utilized as a part of a general in-service program, or to improve the skills of a general supervisory force of a public school system.[3]

The proposed program is thus built upon the rationale that McREL utilized in their Training of Supervising Teachers program. The actual implementation of the proposed program will utilize the modules described below.

MODULE 1 - IMPROVING TEACHER BEHAVIOR (August 7-11)

During the first week of the training workshop the supervising teachers selected for the program will be provided an orientation to the supervisory role and will be instructed in teaching behaviors which have proven successful in the CUTE program. It is considered vital that they be aware of the problem-solving teaching procedures and methods upon which the education component of the CUTE program has been based. The week's activities will culminate in the supervisors demonstrating ability to utilize indirect teaching methods in a micro-teaching setting. Activities have been developed in consultation with Dr. L. O. Andrews, Ohio State University; Dr. Morris Bigge, Fresno State Collegs; Dr. Ernest Bayles, University of Kansas; and Dr. Samuel Shermis, Purdue University.

Educational Outcomes for Week One:

1. Supervisors will develop more favorable attitudes toward pupils as learners.
2. Supervisors will develop strategies for reducing teacher talk.
3. Supervisors will develop strategies for increasing constructive pupil talk.

---

[3]Ibid.

4. Supervisors will learn techniques for increasing amount of indirect teaching behavior.

TOPIC ONE: Orientation to Supervision - A Problem Raising Process

TIME: 6 hours

CONTENT: (Day one of week one)

1. Orientation to program and personnel.
2. Participants get acquainted.
3. Initial micro-teaching experience demonstrating pre-workshop level of participant teaching behavior.
4. Trainer presentation raising problems about past and present practices in student teacher supervision. Possible alternative practices and procedures, ones encouraging collaborative planning, will be offered.
5. Participants' discussion of presentation to develop set of questions for discussion with trainer.
6. Trainer and participants' discussion concerning practices and procedures for supervision.

TOPIC TWO: Teacher Behavior - Stimulating Change in Teacher Attitudes

TIME: 18 hours

CONTENT: (Day two of week one)

1. Three five-minute video-taped episodes of different kinds of teacher attitudes where the learner is viewed as (a) good and active in nature, (b) bad and active in nature, or (c) neither good nor bad but passive in nature.
2. Completion by participants of a brief, diagnostic worksheet questionnaire related to the episode followed by discussion.
3. Trainer presentation of 30-45 minutes discussing the episode in terms of the underlying implications of teacher attitudes.
4. Participants' discussion of trainer presentation.
5. A five to ten minute video-taped episode similar to the one presented in number one but dealing with different age-levels, subject-matter, and instructor.
6. Group analysis of episode by trainer and seminar participants.

CONTENT: (Day three of week one)

1. A five to ten munute video-taped episode of teacher behavior where the learner is viewed as neither good nor bad but interactive in nature. Episode demonstrates indirect teacher behavior and use of higher order questions.
2. Completion by participants of a brief, diagnostic worksheet questionnaire related to the episode followed by discussion.
3. Trainer presentation of 30-45 minutes discussing the episode in terms of the underlying implications of teacher attitudes.
4. Participants' discussion of trainer presentation.
5. A five to ten minute video-taped episode similar to the one presented in number one but dealing with different age-levels, subject-matter, and instructor.

6. Group analysis of episode by trainer and seminar participants.

CONTENT: (Day four of week one)

1. Three five to ten minute video-taped episodes illustrating teacher-dominated, pupil-dominated, and interactive classroom situations.
2. Completion by participants of a brief, diagnostic worksheet-questionnaire related to episodes followed by discussion.
3. Trainer presentation of 30-45 minutes discussing the episodes in terms of the underlying implications of teacher attitudes.
4. Participants' discussion of trainer presentation.
5. Three, five to ten minute video-taped episodes similar to those presented in number one but dealing with different age-levels, subject matter, and instructor.
6. Group analysis of episodes by trainer and seminar participants.

TOPIC THREE: Teacher Behavior - Demonstrating Skill in Using Indirect Teacher Behaviors.

TIME: 6 hours.

CONTENT: (Day five of week one)

1. Two five to ten minute video-taped episodes illustrating contrasting teaching behaviors.
2. Completion by participants of brief diagnostic worksheet-questionnaire related to episodes followed by discussion.
3. Trainer presentation of 30-45 minutes discussing teacher behaviors in terms of episodes.
4. Participants' discussion of trainer presentation.
5. Participants divide into groups to develop a "mini-lesson" for micro-teaching demonstrating use of indirect teaching behaviors with higher-order questioning.
6. Participants micro-teach the "mini-lesson."
7. Analysis and diagnosis of performance by participants and staff trainers.

Performance Criteria for Week One:

At the conclusion of appropriate instructional activities, participants will be able to exhibit the following behaviors:

1. Given video presentations of contrasting classroom situations illustrating different teacher attitudes, the participants can:

   a. Identify favorable and unfavorable teacher attitudes toward pupils.
   b. Support the above conclusions by citing three examples from each episode to justify his identification.

2. Given video-presentations of classroom situations illustrating contrasting teacher attitudes, the participants can:

a. Identify correctly episodes demonstrating teacher-dominated, pupil-dominated, or interactive classroom enviroment.
b. Support the above conclusions by citing three examples from each episode to justify his identification.

3. Given video presentations of classroom situations illustrating teacher styles of behavior, the participant can:

   a. Identify correctly direct and indirect teacher behavior.
   b. Support the above conclusions by citing three examples from each episode justifying this identification.

4. Given one hour preparation the participant can:

   a. Prepare a written plan for a five-minute mini-lesson demonstrating his ability to use indirect teaching behavior and higher-order questioning.
   b. Teach the prepared mini-lesson to a micro-class.

MODULE 2 - SENSITIZATION TO INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS (August 14-18)

During the second week, supervisors will be joined by student-teachers to begin development of collaborative, sensitive work-teams. Evidence from the CUTE program demonstrated additional attention needed to be given and training provided for the development of more effective supervisor-supervisee work interaction.

Training during this week will have a twin focus. First, a supervisor and student teacher will be helped to build an effective working relationship and second, team development will progress to that point where the two persons can share perceptions of classroom problems and teacher behavior. These two foci interact with and feed into each other. The flow of activities during the week will move from a relatively intellective "talking about," level of action and behavior through occasions of observation to a progressively more process analysis, action orientation. Training activities will be structured as an integrated chain of events with emphasis on participatory learning. Experiences shared are not to be seen as beginning on day one and ending on day five, rather they are future oriented. It is hoped that the program will serve as a launching pad for continued learning and development of the supervisor-supervisee teams. Implicit in this notion is both the collaborative development of plans for the future and immediate feedback, thus concepts and skills of interaction developed during the week are to be incorporated in plans and practices of the future. Accountability becomes a part of this process since information and corrective actions may be fed back into the teams and the total teaching system for future development.

There is to be substantial interaction between the supervisor and supervisee. The assumptions are that out of the process of interaction (a) a great deal of "data" will be produced regarding both intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects of the supervisory relationship, (b) the workshop staff will supply substantive information regarding the dynamics of supervisory relationships, and (c) training exercises will facilitate participant understanding of "data" generated in light of the substantive information provided.

Team development and interpersonal relationship exercises lead into the "conference behavior" exercises. Learning activities will follow a developmental, recycling format of (1) cognitive instruction about team relations and skill development, (2) structured practice and simulated experiences in teaching and conferences, (3) less structured experiences for team development, and (4) process analysis. This cycle is repeated several times throughout the workshop with the requisite competencies being emphasized and dealt with in an additive fashion. A central focus of the instruction will be to give major attention to information regarding supervisory competencies in highly structured and less structured settings, and to the continuous analysis of conferencing processes and products. Video-taping will be the major means for instruction and analysis of teaching and conferencing. The end result of the week's process will be a joint production of a plan for the teaching team. Activities for this week have been developed in consultation with Drs. Arthur Blumberg and Wilford Weber, both at Syracuse University.

Educational Outcomes for Week Two:

1. Participants will become more sensitive to interpersonal relations.
2. Team members will become more congruent in their perception of the teacher's role.
3. Supervisors' conference behavior will become more indirect and will facilitate supervisee learning.
4. Supervisors will become reliable observers of conference interaction.
5. Participants will be able to objectively evaluate verbal interaction in classroom settings.
6. Team members will collaboratively plan their teaching interim.

Strategies for Sensitization to Interpersonal Relations

TOPIC: Team Development Through Verbal Interchange

TIME: 12 hours

CONTENT: (Day one of week two)

1. Group orientation to goals of program.
2. Team Development I - Analysis of helping and hindering behaviors.
3. Team Development II - Supervisors sharing their experiences as supervisees. Supervisor and supervisee share perceptions and expectation for supervising-teaching experience.

4. Analysis of perceptions of teacher role.
5. Team Development III - Communication exercise emphasizing the need for open communication and examining the varying effects of one-way and two-way communication.

CONTENT: (Day two of week two)

1. Team Development I - Collaborative analysis of case study.
2. Instruction with McREL Interaction Analysis (MIA).
3. Group observation of classroom episodes on video-tape for behavioral analysis and diagnosis with MIA.
4. Team Development II - Discussion of problems of behavioral change based on Kurt Lewin's force-field analysis, a method of looking at social systems and processes of change.
5. Student teachers are instructed to prepare a five-minute teaching episode for the next day.

TOPIC: Team Development Through Process and Behavioral Analysis

TIME: 12 hours

CONTENT: (Day three of week two)

1. Team Development I - training in the process of problem-solving.
2. Conferencing behavior exercise - attending to supervisor behavioral styles.
3. Supervisor and supervisee pre-teaching conference - discuss student teacher's plans for a five minute mini-lesson for micro-teaching.
4. Supervisee presentation of mini-lesson to classroom pupils.
5. Analyses and diagnoses of teaching behaviors from video-tapes.
6. Supervisor and supervisee post-teaching conference.
7. Staff and supervisor analysis and diagnosis of video-tape of supervisor conference with student teacher.
8. Team process analysis - mutual examination of communication process, level of trust, and level of openness within team.

CONTENT: (Day four of week two)

1. Supervisor and supervisee pre-teaching conference - discuss student teacher's plans for a five minute "mini-lesson" for micro-teaching.
2. Supervisee presentation of mini-lesson.
3. Analyses and diagnoses of teaching behavior from video-tapes.
4. Supervisor-supervisee post-teaching conference.
5. Staff and supervisor analysis and diagnosis of video-tape of supervisor conference with student teacher.
6. Repeat 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 in afternoon. Student teacher reteaches using the modified lesson plan.
7. Team process analysis.

TOPIC: Planning Future Team Development and Activities

TIME: 6 hours

CONTENT: (Day five of week two)

1. Team Planning I - Team members develop collaboratively future plans including teaching and personal goals, teaching responsibilities, and future development and growth of team.
2. Team Shares Plan I - discussion with other teams.
3. Team Planning II - Supervisor and supervisee continuing planning, incorporating new ideas from group sharing.
4. Team Shares Plan II - Discussion with staff on future growth and development for total supervisor-supervisee system, including plans for supervisee independence.
5. Staff review of team development process.

Performance Criteria for Week Two:

Following appropriate instructions:

1. Participants will demonstrate at mid-point testing using the Barrett-Lennard Inventory that team relations are moving in the direction of a perceived ideal supervising-student teacher team as given on a pre-test performance.
2. Participants will develop a force-field analysis of helping and hindering forces in their team relations.
3. Team members will exhibit a more congruent perception of the teacher's role being oriented toward positive affective and motivating behaviors as measured by the Teacher Role Questionnaire.
4. Using Blumberg's Interaction Analysis, staff evaluations of supervising conferences will show supervisors are becoming more indirect and supportive of student teachers in their conference behavior.
5. Supervisees, using Blumberg's Nine-Item Scale, will rate conference sessions as being productive and supervisors as being supportive.
6. Team members will collaboratively produce a written plan for future work relations and procedures structured according to suggestions of the workshop.

MODULE 3 - IN-SERVICE TRAINING (Oct. 13 - Nov. 11, 1972)

Following the two week supervisor workshop and during the first eight weeks of the Fall semester, supervisor-supervisee training continues with five days of in-service training. The first two sessions are scheduled Friday and Saturday of the second teaching week and the remaining three sessions on consecutive Saturdays. During these seminar sessions emphasis will be given to training reliable observers and analyzers of classroom interaction using McREL Interaction Analysis, a modification of Flanders which helps to analyze kinds of questions asked by teachers. Supervisors and supervisees will be given additional occasion to assess their own development of indirectness and skill in questioning. The teaching-conferencing cycle of the workshop is to be repeated here. With establishment of observer reliability during the first portion of in-service session, team members will now be able to evaluate their own interaction during

teaching. Supervisors' conferences following teaching events will again be evaluated for kind of conference interaction using Blumberg's System for Analysis. Further exercises for team development and analysis of interpersonal relations will also be part of the in-service experience.

A final outcome of in-service training will be that supervisor-supervisee teams will jointly develop a teaching plan structuring in strategies for appropriate usage of indirect teaching methodology and higher-order questioning. Educational Outcomes for In-Service:

1. All participants are to become reliable observers of classroom interaction.
2. Supervisors and student teachers are to become more indirect in teaching behavior.
3. Supervisors and student teachers will be able to use higher-order questioning in classroom discussion.
4. Supervisors are to become more indirect and supportive in their conference behavior.
5. Participants will become more sensitive in their interpersonal relations.
6. Supervisor-supervisee teams will jointly develop a teaching plan designed according to workshop emphases.

TOPIC: Training in Interaction Analysis

TIME: 12 hours

CONTENT: (Day one of in-service)

1. Trainer instructs participants about instrument to be used in measuring classroom interaction.
2. Participants' discussion with trainer and examination of categories.
3. Participants practice coding classroom interaction using taped sessions.
4. Participant and trainer analysis and diagnosis of outcome.

CONTENT: (Day two of in-service)

1. Trainer and participant discussion about method of analysis and previous days' experience.
2. Participant practice with taped teaching episodes for practice in coding classroom interaction.
3. Construction of matrices and analysis of classroom interaction viewed from tapes.
4. Participant and trainer analysis and diagnosis of outcome.
5. Participant instructed to tape classroom teaching session, code a ten-minute segment, and develop a matrix.

TOPIC: Skill Development in Questioning, Indirect Teaching and Conferencing and Team Relations

TIME: 18 hours

CONTENT: (Day three of in-service)

1. Staff and supervisor evaluation of taped classroom teaching sessions.
2. Supervisor practice with coding classroom interaction.
3. Team Development Exercise - Supervisor-supervisee discuss problem-solving teaching methodology.
4. Team process analysis.

CONTENT: (Day four of in-service)

1. Supervisor-supervisee discuss supervisee's plan for a five-minute "mini-lesson" for micro-teaching.
2. Supervisee presentation of mini-lesson.
3. Analyses and diagnoses of teaching behavior from video-tapes.
4. Supervisor-supervisee post-teaching conference.
5. Staff and supervisor analysis and diagnosis of video-tape of conference.
6. Repeat 1,2,3,4,5 in afternoon - Student teacher reteaches using the modified lesson plan
7. Team process analysis.
8. Future Plans - Supervisor and supervisee develop a lesson plan with strategies for indirect teaching methodology and higher-order questioning. The supervisee is to teach the lesson plan during the next two weeks. The teaching session and subsequent conference are to be video-taped and analyzed by the supervisor.

CONTENT: (Day five of in-service)

1. Supervisor and supervisee evaluation of taped classroom and conference sessions.
2. Team process analysis.
3. Supervisor practice with coding classroom interaction.
4. Supervisor reliability with coding process determined.

Performance Criteria for In-Service

Given appropriate instructions:

1. Supervisors will demonstrate ability to objectively evaluate teaching in that they can:

    a. Associate the verbal behavior categories of interaction analysis with their appropriate code numbers.
    b. Categorize classroom verbal behavior (using interaction analysis categories) at a rate between 17 and 22 categories per minute over a ten-minute period of time.
    c. Categorize a minimum of ten minutes of classroom verbal behavior with intra-observer reliability of at least .60.

d. Plot an interaction matrix of 100 tallies with no more than a 5 % error.
e. Interpret the meaning of any of the 100 cells of an interaction analysis matrix.
f. Compute and interpret the meaning of the I/D, revised i/d, percentage of teacher talk and percentage of pupil talk.

2. Using McREL Interaction Analysis, participants' evaluation of video-tapes of their teaching will demonstrate that they are becoming more indirect and using higher-order questioning.
3. Team members will exhibit a more congruent perception of the teachers' role being oriented toward positive affective and motivating behaviors as measured by the Teacher Role Questionnaire.
4. Using Blumberg's Interaction Analysis staff evaluation of supervisor-supervisee conferences will show that the supervisor is becoming more indirect and supportive with the student teacher.
5. Supervisees, using Blumberg's Nine-Item Scale, will rate conference sessions as being productive and supervisors as being supportive.
6. Participants will demonstrate on a post-test of the Barrett-Lennard inventory that team relations have become more congruent with the perceived ideal supervisor-student teaching team as given on a pre-test performance.
7. Supervisor-supervisee teams will produce a collaboratively developed teaching plan with strategies for appropriate usage of indirect teaching methodology and higher-order questioning.

PROCEDURES:

Supervisors and student teachers' behaviors will be the primary focus of evaluation. Progress of participants will be assessed through both summative and formative data. Formative data will provide the workshop staff with information regarding the effectiveness of the workshop on a continual basis during the process experience. Participants' achievement of educational outcomes will be determined from summative data.

Population. Members of the proposed experimental group, or those to receive workshop and in-service training, will be selected on a volunteer basis from supervising teachers and student teachers in the Fall student teaching program at Ottawa University. Tentative plans call for selection of seven teams from the elementary grades (1-6) and seven from Junior High (7-9), in cooperation with USD 290. There will be a total of 14 teams of supervisors and student teachers.

Data Collection Instruments. To measure participants' performance relative to educational outcomes the following instruments are under consideration:

Teaching Behavior - McREL Interaction Analysis, Teacher Role Questionnaire, and written reports

Conference Behavior - Blumberg Interaction Analysis and Blumberg Nine-Item Scale

Interpersonal Relations - Barrett-Lennard Inventory

Formative Data.

1. Feedback will be obtained regarding the participant's perception of training exercises:

   a. Perceptions of effectiveness of the exercise in terms of his needs.
   b. Feelings about the nature of the exercise, the role of the workshop staff and adequacy of materials.
   c. Estimate of own progress in terms of stated objectives.

2. During the second week of the workshop the staff will systematically record their observations of interaction processes. Observations will be content analyzed and reported in summary form.

PROGRAM DESIGN

The program will begin in the summer of 1972. It will run continuously for two weeks in August with an additional five days scheduled on Saturdays from October 14 to November 18. The first meeting in October will include Friday and Saturday (13 and 14). The program format will necessitate two days to begin Module III. The first week will contain only the supervising teacher participants and will focus around the Module 1 format. The second week will place the supervising teachers and their student teachers together to implement Module 2. The third week, to accomplish Module 3, will be spread over a period of time immediately prior to the beginning of and overlap with the student teaching session which begins on October 31, 1972.

Where possible, the elementary school supervising teacher participants will be drawn from Grades 1-6 in Title I schools. The junior high supervising teacher participants will be distributed from all grade levels, 7-9.

IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM

To implement the proposal, Ottawa University plans to:

(1) Begin this proposal in cooperation with USD 290, Ottawa, Kansas in the selection of supervising-teacher participants.
(2) Expand participant population the second year to other school districts outside Ottawa, to further test the program in different settings, rural to suburban.
(3) The third year, assuming our hypothesis to be correct, implement the proposed program as the standard program in student teaching at Ottawa University.

PROPOSED PROGRAM PERSONNEL NEEDS

Coordinator Dr. O. L. Gladman will coordinate this proposed program. He holds a B.A. degree in Elementary Education, an M.A. in Elementary School Administration and an Ed.D. in Educational Administration and Curriculum.

Dr. Gladman's experience in teaching and administration covers a period of 16 years in public elementary schools as a teacher, and college-university teaching-supervisory roles. He has served as Director of Elementary Student Teaching and has actively supervised student teachers for a period of ten years. During the summers of 1968 and 1970 he directed two federally supported NDEA (EPDA) institutes for Teachers of Disadvantaged Youth. Currently he serves as Chairman of the Education Department at Ottawa University.

Assistant Coordinator - Consultant

This person (or persons) will be utilized to derive greatest benefit for the program. A combination of several kinds of involvement will be used. A McREL staff member will be available on a part time basis. Consultants will be utilized when appropriate and part time coordination of the total program will be placed in the hands of an assistant coordinator.

Technician

Mr. Frank Horton has served as a media technician at Ottawa University. He will be able to serve as technical instructor for the station supervision in the video tape process at each of the four video tape stations. His expertise in the media-audiovisual field also permits him to trouble shoot and keep the equipment operating smoothly throughout the technical phase of the proposed program.

Station Supervisors (4)

Four persons will be employed and trained to handle this important segment of the proposed program. These will be students of senior standing who have interest in the media field or other appropriate persons so determined by the coordinator of the project.

Secretary

A student secretary will be employed. She will work two full weeks in August while the project is in session. She will be available half time during Module III operation and half time for one week during the post-project phase of writing the final report.

PARTICIPANT POPULATION

There will be a total of fourteen supervising teacher participants. Seven supervising teachers will come from grades 1-6 and seven from grades 7-9. All will be regularly certified and employed teachers of Unified School District #290, Ottawa, Kansas.

Student teacher participants will come from those Ottawa University students who are scheduled to complete their student teaching program in the fall of 1972. Students will be selected randomly - seven from the elementary program and seven from the secondary (Junior High) program.

PROPOSED CALENDAR

Phase I - August 7-11

Module I - "Improving Teacher Behavior" - Supervising Teacher Participants

Phase II - August 14-18

Module II - "Sensitization to Interpersonal Relations"

Student teacher and their assigned supervising teachers.

Phase III - October 13-14, 21, 28 and November 4 and 11

Module III - In-service training for supervising teachers and student teachers.